

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman from Texas will state his point of order.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we made very clear our intention to ask for a record vote on that. At the time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] stood up on the compact commission matter, he raised a point of order that a quorum was not present and that did not lock in a record vote. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] specifically asked what action he was supposed to take to lock in a record vote.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Chair to grant us our motion for the yeas and nays to be ordered on H.R. 558.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my point that I made earlier and ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the yeas and nays are ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule 1, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1617, CONSOLIDATED AND REFORMED EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND REHABILITATION SYSTEMS ACT (CAREERS ACT)

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-249) on the resolution (H. Res. 222) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1617) to consolidate and reform work force development and literacy programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

#### FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to the order of the House of today and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 39.

□ 1816

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 39) to amend

the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act to improve fisheries management, with Mr. GOODLATTE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a unique period of time that we are faced with during this session. We have a bill that has been heard by the committee and we have worked on this bill for approximately 3½ years now. It is H.R. 39, the Fisheries Conservation and Management Amendments of 1995, which I sponsored, along with my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 39, the Fishery Conservation and Management Amendments of 1995, which I sponsored.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation, as you will see, enjoys broad, bipartisan support from members of the Resources Committee and those members from coastal districts with fishing interests. For this bill to have come this far shows the bipartisan effort involved in the development of the bill. I want to thank Subcommittee Chairman SAXTON, GERRY STUDDS, and GEORGE MILLER for their leadership in addressing the difficult issues in this important legislation.

This reauthorization of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 is crucial to continuing the sound management of this Nation's fishery resources. If Members take nothing else away from this debate, remember, this legislation is supported by Members on both sides of the aisle, by the fishing industry, and by the environmental community.

This has been no small feat, and while some may not be entirely happy with the legislation, reauthorization of this act is very important to us all.

Mr. Chairman, during the 103d and 104th Congresses, 10 hearings on reauthorization issues were held. This legislation represents an attempt to address the concerns raised at these hearings. This legislation may not be perfect; however, fisheries management is a complicated balancing act. We have attempted to address the concerns raised by commercial fishermen, recreational and charter boat fishermen, environmental organizations, fishing communities, fish processors, and other interested groups.

The Magnuson Act was enacted in 1976 in direct response to the depletion of U.S. fishery resources by foreign vessels. The Magnuson Act expanded U.S.

jurisdiction over fishery resources to 200 miles. The Act also included provisions intended to encourage the development of a domestic fishing industry.

The act created eight Regional Fishery Management Councils to manage the fishery resources within their geographic area. The Councils were charged with determining the appropriate level of harvest to maximize the benefit to the Nation while still protecting the long-term sustainability of the stocks.

This means the Councils must balance the often competing interests of commercial and recreational fishermen, and the often competing gear groups within the commercial industry.

It is important to note that the committee continues to strongly support the current Regional Fishery Management Councils system. This legislation includes some reforms of the Council process and requires new disclosure rules to deal with the perception of conflict of interest on the Councils.

While this legislation deals with the fishing industry, it is environment friendly. In fact, you have probably received or will receive letters of support from many of the national environmental groups. We think that we have crafted a bill which will allow fishermen to make a living from the sea while also making them better stewards of the resources they rely on for their livelihood.

Three major areas needed to be addressed in this reauthorization to maintain healthy fisheries and healthy fishing communities. For the domestic fishery resource to remain healthy, fishery managers must take steps to reduce bycatch and the mortality of discards in the fisheries, to prevent the overfishing of stocks and rebuild those stocks which are already overfished, and, finally, to protect habitat essential for the continued renewal of the fisheries.

The reduction of bycatch in our fisheries is one of the most crucial challenges facing fisheries managers today. In the North Pacific groundfish fishery alone, more than 740 million pounds of fish were discarded, in 1993. That represents 16 percent of the total catch of the fishery. Much of that discard is of prohibited species. It is clear that this is unacceptable. We hope that the requirements of this bill will help Councils address the problem of bycatch, and we hope that fishermen will respond with innovative methods of reducing bycatch.

In particular, this legislation requires the Regional Fishery Management Councils to amend all existing Fishery Management Plans to reduce bycatch to the maximum extent practicable. It also provides the Councils with the ability to offer incentives to fishermen to reduce their bycatch.

A second area of concern is the protection of essential habitat. This has been a tough issue to wrestle with. We do not want to over-regulate the fishing industry; however, the Councils